

REMARKS

An obvious typographical error in claim 12 has been corrected.

Claims 1, 5-7, 10, 15 and 20-22 were rejected under 35 USC § 102 over Mulvaney. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 20-22 relate to a process in which a polymerizable group—containing silane coupling agent is absorbed onto the surfaces of silica-coated metal particles, and a polymeric resin coating is formed on the surfaces of by polymerizing a composition comprising a polymerizable monomer. Mulvaney teaches at column 2, lines 28-49, a process in which a mixture of nanoparticles, coating composition and ligand is prepared, and the coating and ligand are deposited on the particles. While the reference does indicate that the methods employed therein are conventional, there is no teaching or suggestion of a process in which a coupling agent is first absorbed on the surface of a silica-coated metal and thereafter a resin coating is formed by polymerizing a polymerizable monomer. The reference to polymers in column 10, noted by the Examiner, concerns the use of polymers to increase viscosity. These claims are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by this reference.

The other rejected claims relate a particle which has a metal core, a silica layer covering the surface of the core, and a polymerized resin layer covering the silica layer. Mulvaney teaches a particle, which may or may not be a metal, coated with a coating layer which may be the same material as the core or be an insulating, semiconducting and/or metallic coating. Column 6, lines 41. Silica may be used as the coating, and there may be

multiple coating layers. However, there is no disclosure of a silica coated metallic core where the silica is covered by a polymerized resin layer. An ambiguous (and at best generic) passing reference to “multiple layers of coatings” (col. 6, lines 58-59) is insufficient to constitute anticipation, *Corning Glass Works v. Sumitomo Electric U.S.A., Inc.*, 9 USPQ2d 1962, 1970 (Fed. Cir. 1898)(generic term does not, without more, inherently disclose all species), nor does it make a more detailed structure obvious. Here also, the polymers noted by the Examiner in column 10, are for increasing viscosity. These claims are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by this reference.

Claim 2 was rejected under 36 USC § 103 over Mulvaney in view of Nakawaza, and claims 9, 11-14 and 16 were rejected under 36 USC § 103 over Mulvaney in view of Nakatsuka, Hakata and Mizuno. Both of these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Mulvaney has been discussed above. None of the Nakawaza, Nakatsuka, Hakata and Mizuno references were cited to overcome the deficiencies in the primary reference, and in fact, they do not. Nakawaza was cited only to show rapid cooling. Nakatsuka teaches in [0013], a multilayer-coated powder (metal [0015] or polymer [0016]) in which at least one layer is a metal hydroxide or a metal oxide, and in which another layer may be silica, as shown in the titania-coated silica-coated iron powder of Example 1, but does not disclose a polymer-coated silica-coated metal core. Hakata was cited to show developers comprise toner and carriers, and Mizuno to show a particular particle size. Since these secondary references do not cure the basis deficiencies of Mulvaney, no further discussion is warranted. The combinations do not render the claimed invention obvious.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Edward A. Meilman/
Edward A. Meilman

Registration No.: 24,735
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant